

Freedom

VOL. XXXVI.—No. 393.

MARCH, 1922.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Engineers' Lock-out.

In the springtime the employers' fancy lightly turns to thoughts of lock-outs. Last spring the mineowners locked out the miners, and now the Engineering Employers' Federation has locked out 400,000 members of the Amalgamated Engineers' Union, who have refused to allow the employers to be sole judges as to when overtime is necessary. The A.E.U. had 100,000 members unemployed before the trouble started, and its contention is that these men should be employed before unconditional overtime is allowed. The employers' point of view is that they are going to do as they like with their own. The attitude of the employers and that of the A.E.U. are so opposed to each other that compromise is impossible, so the employers have decided to try to starve the men into submission, and it is quite certain they will do so unless the area of the conflict is considerably enlarged. With their funds drained by the payment of unemployed benefit, the Union is not in a position to carry on a long struggle, and the employers have chosen the most suitable moment, from their point of view, to declare war on their workers. And the employers have at their command the most deadly of all weapons, the weapon of starvation. However long the lock-out lasts, they will not be without a square meal, but every week the men and their families will feel the pinch of hunger more and more. It is a terribly one-sided battle. The unfortunate thing is that the workers generally cannot be brought to see that the present system must be abolished. It is useless to fight the evils of the system whilst allowing the system to remain. Without a square foot of land from which to gain an independent livelihood, they are at the mercy of the employers, and the strongest of Trade Unions is useless when it comes to a fight to a finish, as was shown in the miners' lock-out last year. We hope the workers will soon be forced to realise that the war they are now engaged in will never end until they join together and reconquer the land and its wealth of which they have been dispossessed. There is no other way out.

The War on the Rand.

Since gold was first discovered on the Rand, it has been the plague-spot of South Africa. In fact, we have no hesitation in saying that there has been more vice and brutality packed into those few square miles than in any other place on the face of the globe. To get control of the mines, this country was dragged into the Boer War by the most unscrupulous gang of scoundrels that ever wore boots. In the early days of the Rand, bogus companies were floated almost daily, and it was once said that investors put more gold into those companies than would ever be got out of the mines. Then came the Jameson Raid, which should have opened the eyes of our countrymen as to the villainy afoot there. But when the newspaper campaign which led up to the Boer War was in full swing they swallowed all the lies they were told about the ill-treatment of Britishers by the Boers, and backed Chamberlain and Rhodes during the three years the war lasted. No good could ever be expected from an industry founded under such circumstances, and should the earth open and swallow the mines and everyone connected with them, the world would be much sweeter and cleaner. The extraction of gold has never added anything to the real wealth of the world, and as a medium of exchange its substitute could easily be provided by the printing press. The present trouble on the Rand, we are told, is due to the mineowners' attempt to substitute black labour for white labour in the mines, which, of course, is

but another way of cutting down wages. But the conflict between Capital and Labour is complicated by the desire of the Dutch to restore the Republic which was swept away by the Three Years' War. General Smuts, whom some of our pacifists hailed as a great statesman at the time of the Versailles Peace Conference, is proving as ruthless now as when he deported the Labour leaders in the last great strike in Johannesburg; and all the stories about Bolshevism and Soviets are merely an excuse for the aeroplanes and bombs which he is using against the strikers. With plenty of force at his disposal, the men will be beaten and many of them driven from the Rand. In that case they may be compelled to go back to their farms and take up the more useful and healthy occupation of raising food from the earth instead of gold.

State Morality.

The recent case at the Central Criminal Court, in which a rich man and his wife were charged with obtaining money from bookmakers by means of forged telegrams, should draw attention to the hypocrisy of the State in the matter of betting. Day after day in all parts of the country men and women are brought before magistrates and fined for betting in the streets or for using their houses for betting purposes, yet in the above case it was proved in evidence that the postmaster and the telegraph clerks accepted and dispatched telegrams making bets on horse-races. We know also that telegraph clerks have special orders to expedite betting telegrams, and at every race-meeting the Post Office provides every facility for such telegrams to and from the course. In the above case the judge asked a witness, who was a bookmaker: "Could you carry on your business without the Government Post Office?" and the bookmaker replied: "No, my lord." Yet to-morrow you will read in the paper of this same Government prosecuting some poor devil for betting in the street, and the paper which publishes the report will at the same time publish the latest betting and racing telegrams delivered to it by the Government Post Office. It is the same with the sale of opium. Chinese and others here are often fined or sent to prison for selling opium or keeping places where it is used, although the production of the opium they sell is a Government monopoly in India, where it is an important source of revenue, as it is in many of the British dependencies in the East. In fact, we fought two wars with China to compel her to allow opium to be imported. The hypocrisy of this two-faced attitude is typical of the State, which steadily seeks monopoly in every direction, in gambling and vice as well as murder.

The Irish "Free" State.

According to the *Cork Weekly Examiner* (January 7), the following decree, issued by the Irish Republic in August, 1920, and now countersigned by the Department of Home Affairs, was posted on New Year's Day:—

"Emigration from Ireland.—It is hereby decreed that after the date of this decree no citizen of the Irish Republic shall be permitted to leave Ireland for the purpose of settling abroad without the written sanction of the Government of the Irish Republic."

It stated that this decree applied to every citizen, "man, woman or child, soldier or civilian." Apparently, the Free State, like every other State, regards its citizens as its personal property. It may be called the Irish Free State, but it certainly cannot be called the Free Irish State.

Push the sale of "Freedom."

REMINISCENCES OF KROPOTKIN.

By ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

Our comrade Alexander Berkman has kindly sent us the following translation of an article which he wrote specially for the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme," of New York.

Soon after I came to Russia I began to hear rumours about Peter Kropotkin. They were very conflicting: some said he was favourable to the Bolsheviks, others that he was against them; that he was living in comparatively satisfactory material circumstances, and again that he was practically starving; and so forth. I was anxious to learn the truth of the matter. Besides, I was very eager to see him personally. In the years past I had had a sporadic correspondence with him, but we had never met. I was a great admirer of his since my early youth, when I first heard his name and became acquainted with his writings. One incident, in particular, had left a very deep impression on me, characteristic as it was of the whole man, and had won my love and esteem.

It was in the year 1890, I believe. The Jewish Anarchist movement was in its infancy in America. We were just a handful then, and we used to hold our weekly public meetings in a very modest hall in Orchard Street. We were few, but we were fired by the enthusiasm of a sublime ideal and we were most wholeheartedly consecrating all our young energies and ability, and most of our very small earnings, to the propaganda of Anarchist ideas among the population of the Ghetto. And we were very successful; every week greater numbers attended our gatherings, much interest was manifested in the revolutionary teachings, and the vital questions were discussed passionately, though often with greater conviction than intelligence. To some of us it then seemed that cursed Capitalism had about reached the limit of its fiendish possibilities, and that the Social Revolution could not be very far off. But there were many difficult questions and knotty problems involved in the growing movement and in the approaching Social Revolution, which we ourselves could not solve quite satisfactorily. We longed to have our great teacher Kropotkin among us, if only for a short visit, to have him clear up many complex points and give us the benefit of his intellectual aid and inspiration. And then, what a stimulus his presence would be for the movement!

We were only a handful, I said, but each and every one of us was most willing to reduce his living expenses to the lowest minimum and devote his earnings of weeks, even of months, if necessary, to defray the expenses involved in our invitation to Kropotkin to visit America. Thoroughly the matter was discussed in several little group meetings of the most active and devoted comrades; we were all enthusiastically unanimous in the great plan. A long letter was sent to our dear teacher, asking him to come for a lecture tour to America, assuring him of the great field awaiting him, and emphasising our need of him.

His reply was negative. It threw us all for awhile into a state of depression; we had been so sure of his acceptance, so convinced of the necessity of his coming and of the great results to the movement. But the great admiration we felt for him was heightened almost to a halo when we learned the motives for his refusal. He would very much like to come—Kropotkin wrote—and he appreciated deeply the spirit of our invitation. He hoped to visit the United States some time in the future, and it would give him great joy to be among such good comrades. But just now he could not afford to come at his own expense, and he would not use the money of the movement even for such a purpose.

I pondered deeply over his words. His viewpoint was just, I thought, but it could apply only under ordinary circumstances. His case, however, was not an ordinary one; it was exceptional. His considerations were weighty, indeed; but the importance of a Kropotkin propaganda tour in America was to me more vital than even those considerations. I regretted his decision not to come. But his motives epitomised to me the whole man and all the grandeur of his nature. I visioned him as my ideal of revolutionist and Anarchist.

* * * * *

It was not till March, 1920, that I was given an opportunity to visit Peter Kropotkin. He was living in Dmitroff, a small town 60 versts from Moscow. The railroad situation of Russia was then in a most deplorable state; travelling from Petrograd to Dmitroff merely for the purpose of a visit was not to be thought of. But the arrival in Petrograd of George Lansbury, the editor of the London *Daily Herald*, brought me the possibility of reaching Moscow. Lansbury was given a

special car, and as his interpreter I accompanied him to the capital. After spending some time in Moscow, the English visitor was enabled by the Government to travel to Dmitroff. With two other Moscow comrades I took advantage of the opportunity.

Meeting "celebrities" is very often a great disappointment. Somehow, the picture of our imagination does not tally with the reality. But it was not so in the case of Kropotkin; both physically and spiritually he corresponded, almost exactly, to the mental portrait I had made of him. He looked remarkably like his photographs, with his kindly eyes, sweet smile, and generous beard. It may sound strange, but every time that Kropotkin entered the room it seemed to light up in some peculiar manner by his presence. The stamp of the idealist was so strikingly upon him, the spirituality of his personality could actually be sensed. But I was shocked at the sight of his emaciation and his evident feebleness; he looked systematically undernourished, half-starved, and too old for his age.

I learned that the food problem was a very severe one in the Kropotkin household, as indeed it was in every home throughout the length and breadth of starving Russia. (With the usual exception, of course, of some unprincipled commissars and the secret speculators.) Kropotkin was receiving the so-called academic *pah-yok*, or its equivalent, given to a certain number of scientists and old revolutionists. It was considerably more, in quantity and quality, than the ration issued to the ordinary citizen. But it was far from sufficient to support life. Fortunately, Kropotkin was receiving, from time to time, food packages from the comrades abroad and from the Ukraina. But with all that, the Kropotkin household (his wife and daughter Sasha) had great difficulty in keeping the wolf from their door. The question of fuel and lighting also was a matter of constant worry. The winters were severe, and wood very scarce. Kerosine was difficult to procure, and it was considered a great luxury, that could rarely be indulged in, to burn more than one lamp at a time. This lack was especially felt by Kropotkin: it greatly handicapped his literary labours.

All this I learned, of course, from Sophie Grigoryevna and Sasha. Not a word would Kropotkin himself say about the difficulties of his existence. But it was evident that his isolation weighed heavily upon him. Several times the Kropotkin family had been dispossessed of their home in Moscow, their quarters being requisitioned for Government purposes. They decided to move to Dmitroff. It was only about half a hundred versts from the capital, but it might as well have been thousands of miles away, for it cut Kropotkin off as completely as a prison, almost. Owing to the critical condition of the transport system, and to the general situation at that period, the friends of Kropotkin could but rarely visit him. News from the Western world, scientific works, foreign publications—all that was unattainable. Kropotkin felt deeply the lack of intellectual companionship and mental relaxation.

Twice I visited Peter Kropotkin in Dmitroff: in March and again in July, 1920. On the second occasion he looked much improved; not so emaciated, a healthier colour in his face, stronger and more active. The sunshine of the splendid summer was benefitting him tremendously. He was walking about in the little garden adjoining the Kropotkin cottage, and proudly pointing out to his visitors the fine results of Sophie's handiwork, the vegetable patches in full bloom. His eyes shone brightly; the clear blue of the sky seemed reflected in them. They were peculiar eyes that charmed one by a smile of upwelling goodwill. They were a human camera lens, instantaneously mirroring the whole personality of Kropotkin: his love of man and of Nature, and his innate sacred respect for all life.

We discussed many subjects. I found Kropotkin emphatically, irrevocably opposed to the Bolsheviks. Or, rather, as he repeatedly insisted, he was an uncompromising enemy of State Socialism, of Communism imposed by country-wide violence, and of Marxism in general. Nothing else could have been expected of the Bolsheviks, he stated. They were Marxians in theory and in aims; they were bent upon creating an all-powerful, absolute State. Their revolutionary slogans of the October-November days (1917) have sorely misled the proletariat and the peasantry, and particularly the Anarchists. The Anarchists had known, of course, that a State, a Government based on force, whatever its euphonious name, is always a wrong and an evil; but in 1917 they saw in the Bolsheviks a great revolutionary factor, and they blinded themselves to the dangers inherent in the very philosophy of Marxism. The Anarchists of Russia worked hand in hand with the Bolsheviks for the success of the Revolution, they fought side by side, fought devotedly, heroically. Hundreds of them laid down their lives—and now? Now they are persecuted, hounded, every expression forbidden them, many of them in prison for their ideas, and some even shot. And what have the Bolsheviks, now for almost three years in complete control of the government and of the entire economic and

social life of the country, what have they done for the people? "I am not speaking of the starved and ruined condition of Russia, though that is by no means due entirely to intervention and the blockade. State Communism and the methods of the Bolsheviks have no small share of responsibility for that. Their mad passion for centralisation, their inefficiency in the practical affairs of life—not to speak of corruption—above all, their entire ignorance of agrarian questions and of peasant psychology, all that is in great measure responsible for the present economic condition of Russia. But not this I am emphasising just now. What I want particularly to point out to you at this time"—and Kropotkin looked at me with eyes full of pain, and indignation trembled in his voice—"is the attitude of the Bolshevik State to the people—to the individual and to the collectivity. I can hardly speak of it quietly. Suppression and terrorism, these are Bolshevik means, applied even to the friends of the Revolution. Instead of deepening the Revolution, they are now concerned only in securing their governmental power. They have entirely lost sight of the very essentials of the Revolution: continuous, progressive revolutionising of the masses; the largest opportunity and encouragement for the people's initiative, self-expression, organisation, and their voluntary co-operation. Lost sight of it, did I say? No, they are deliberately and systematically suppressing, even exterminating every symptom of it. That is the terrible tragedy of the Russian Revolution."

It was evident how deeply Kropotkin was suffering from the way the Bolsheviks were "managing" the Revolution, as he bitterly characterised the whole situation. He condemned their attitude of suppression of all other revolutionary parties and movements, and he was especially indignant at their policy of imprisoning and even shooting the Anarchists. It was barbarism, not revolution, he said. He spoke at length of the destruction by the Bolsheviks of the great Co-operative movement of Russia, pointing out the fatal consequences in their economic and politico-social aspects; they had helped to bring the country to the verge of economic ruin, on the one hand, and, on the other, had antagonised great masses of the politically neutral element to the point of counter-revolution. The Co-operative movement of Russia had been a tremendous force in the life of the country, not only economically but also in the cultural sense. Their activities included not only manufacturing, financing peasant undertakings, buying and selling, but they also conducted an effective educational campaign, especially among the peasantry. True, the co-operatives were by no means revolutionary organisations. They comprised the most various political elements, but the active reactionaries were generally in the higher official strata of the movement and could have been eliminated without destroying the organisation as a whole. The economic machinery of the co-operatives was a highly efficient apparatus, absolutely necessary to the vital interests of the Revolution. In January, 1918, the co-operatives consisted of 25,000 branches, scattered all over Russia, and had a membership of 9,000,000. Their invested capital at that time amounted to over 15,000,000 roubles, while the business transacted the previous year exceeded 200,000,000 roubles. This powerful organisation functioned most effectively in practically every city, town, and village of Russia.

The Bolsheviks first paralysed, then entirely "liquidated," destroyed, the co-operatives. This was suicidal to the Revolution. It hastened the economic breakdown, for the Bolshevik State could neither effectively organise the collection of foodstuffs, nor properly distribute them. Millions of tons of precious foodstuffs were rotting away, lying exposed on the roads—the co-operatives had been abolished, the machinery of local distribution destroyed, and the Communist State unprepared, inexperienced, and absolutely inefficient in the matter. Moreover, this criminal stupidity of the Bolshevik policy toward the co-operatives, in reality the logical result of their centralised, State Socialist philosophy, necessarily involved numerous other fatal steps that ultimately led to the undoing of the Revolution and of the country. Unable to procure the food supplies required by the army and the population, the Bolshevik Government soon resorted to the system of *razvyorstka*, collection by force. It was a drastic method, characterised by violence and extreme brutality. It could not fail to antagonise the people, particularly the peasantry. It was too vivid a reminder of Tsarist times. The peasants at first protested against the injustice and the autocracy of this economic policy of the Bolsheviks, but their protests were in vain. As a rule, they were followed by repressive measures. The Bolsheviks were determined to prove themselves a "strong power," one "not to be trifled with," as was the popular Governmental phrase. Appeals, complaints, and protests failing, the peasants began to resist forced collection. The Government sent punitive expeditions against them, wreaking terrible vengeance upon whole villages. These punitive expeditions, always led by Communists and Tchekists, represented the extreme of brutality; often the whole population of a village would be whipped, everything taken from the peasant homes, and sometimes even the village destroyed. This policy toward the Russian peasantry was, in the words of Kropotkin, the blackest page of Bolshevism.

These things, terrible as they were, were not new to me; I had heard about them, from various sources, even before my visits to Kropotkin. But I was very friendly to the Bolsheviks at that time, and I was inclined to think that the reports of Bolshevik cruelty were highly exaggerated, and their peasant policy misinterpreted or misunderstood.

I had come to Russia with a passionate enthusiasm for the Revolu-

tion and a deep faith in its possibilities. I realised the stupendous difficulties of the situation, the constant menace of the interventionists, the inevitable results of the blockade, and the many complex new problems that demanded solution. I was determined to contribute to the best of my ability to the great work. I knew, of course, that the Bolsheviks were Marxists, adherents of a strong centralised State power. But their truly revolutionary attitude in the October days of the Revolution, their frequently Anarchistic watchwords, their initial activities—all these led me to believe that not mere Socialist theory but the best interests of the Revolution itself were their guiding star. True, I had observed considerable injustice and much inequality during even the first weeks of my presence in Russia, but I sought to stifle within me any doubt of the revolutionary integrity of the Bolsheviks. I stood close to the leaders of the movement, met them frequently, and felt very friendly to them and their work. Even as my stay in the country lengthened, and I saw much that seemed to contradict my conception of revolutionary aim and effort, still I clung to my faith in the Bolsheviks as a revolutionary factor. The accumulating evidence to the contrary I tried to explain away, even to myself. The unpleasant facts were sporadic, I tried to believe; accidental, frequently; or else incidental to the inevitable confusion of the transitory stage, unfortunate results of revolutionary necessity, mostly due to the pressing need of the critical moment.

It is so painful, so hard to be robbed of a cherished illusion! I could not, I would not, believe what I heard on every side about the Bolshevik methods, about their repressive measures and brutality. I would not form too hasty an opinion from the evidence even of my own eyes. Nor would I take for granted what Kropotkin related to me. He may be misinformed, or his attitude coloured by partisan feeling. But all that I heard from him and from others, especially in reference to the agrarian policy of the Bolsheviks, served to strengthen my determination to investigate the whole situation for myself, and learn at first hand. I was then on my way to the Ukraine; the journey would afford me the opportunity to study the situation thoroughly. The circumstances were particularly favourable. I was the *predsedatel* (chairman) of a special expedition by the Museum of the Revolution, our purpose being to collect all available data of the Revolution itself, as well as all historic material pertaining to the revolutionary movement of Russia during the last hundred years. We had a special car at our disposal, with the right of travel throughout Southern Russia, and the rare opportunity of visiting any place we pleased and communicating with persons in every walk of life. Moreover, it was my particular function to get in touch with the Labour organisations, as well as with illegal and underground revolutionary elements. In short, it was a most exceptional and ideal opportunity to study the Russian Revolution, to learn the condition of the country, to get in touch with the workers and the peasants, and even to investigate the prisons and the concentration camps.

It is not within the scope of the present article to detail the rich experience of that journey, lasting four months. I intend to do that later, fully and completely, and as impartially as possible. But here I want to state, most emphatically, that what I had heard in Petrograd and in Moscow, and all that Kropotkin had told me, pale almost into insignificance when compared with what I saw in my various journeys, first to the Ukraine, then to the North of Russia, and finally in the West. Sad as it is to relate, it was all true; indeed, more and worse things had happened and were continuing to happen. The Bolshevik *razvyorstka* did things which Tsardom at its worst had never surpassed. It seemed absolutely incredible that a revolutionary Government, even if Marxist, could degenerate to such depths of revolting brutality and barbaric vengeance. Vengeance—that alone characterises adequately the mad Bolshevik policy toward the peasantry. *Razvyorstka*—forcible food collection run amuck. Whole villages had been devastated, depopulated. I visited villages bare of all adult male population; the men had been shot, and only the women and boys under the age of fourteen remained. In others, the men had been whipped, one by one, and then forcibly drafted into the army, irrespective of their ages. In some villages the men, after repeated experiences with the "punitive Communists," had run away into the mountains or the forests, there to become the so-called "Greens" and wage merciless guerilla warfare in revenge against the Bolsheviks. I saw villages where the *razvyorstka* had carried off the last pod of flour, and even the seeds the peasant had saved for the next planting. Cows and horses, over and above the lawful tax, had been taken, even the last domestic fowl, blankets and pillows torn to shreds, leaving the villages as bare as a dry bone. Whole villages had been razed to the ground by artillery of the punitive Bolshevik expeditions, both as a punishment and as a terrifying example to the peasantry of the neighbourhood. I found that the word "Communism" had become synonymous in the popular mind with Tchekism, with injustice, oppression, and violence. The name of Communist was hated, in the cities and towns generally, and in the villages universally, with a hatred deep, lasting, and passionate; a hatred terrifyingly intense, born of cheated hopes and duped martyrdom.

This agrarian "policy" of the Bolsheviks sounded the death-knell of the Revolution. How just were Kropotkin's words, repeatedly emphasised in letters and to visitors: "The Bolsheviks have demonstrated to the world how not to make a Revolution."

Stockholm, January, 1922.

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, Twopence; post-free, 3d. Annual Subscription, 3s. post-free.
U.S.A. and Canada, \$1.00. France and the Continent, 2s. 6d.
Wholesale price, 1s. 6d. per dozen (13) post-free in the United Kingdom.

All communications, exchanges, etc., to be addressed to
Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N. W. 1.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice, your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month to ensure receipt of paper.

Money and Postal Orders to be made payable to FREEDOM PRESS.

Emigration or Expropriation.

The latest figures dealing with foreign trade show that it is still declining. The value of our imports for February last was £69,000,000, a decrease of £27,000,000 compared with the same month last year, and of £101,000,000 compared with 1920. The value of our exports for February was £58,000,000, a decrease of £10,000,000 on the same month in 1921, and of £27,000,000 on 1920. These figures should surely dispel all hope for the unemployed, because it is obvious that the possibility of our two million unemployed getting work has vanished for some years to come. Look where you may, there is no sign of any great increase of customers for our manufactured goods. In Europe, Asia, Africa, and America the same tale is told of unemployment and disorganisation of industry; and at home the amount of idle land is increasing, over 400,000 acres of arable land having gone out of cultivation during the past twelve months.

But although the unemployed do not seem to have grasped the facts of the situation, our rulers have at last realised the danger of a large standing army of semi-starving workless men, and the Government is working out a scheme of emigration, by which it hopes to relieve the pressure at home and at the same time provide a population for the exploitation and defence of the Colonies. In a recent issue the *Daily Telegraph* dealt with the problem, and said it was a matter of great urgency. It is not, the writer said, a question as to how much the State can afford to spend, but as to how rapidly the administrative machinery can be made to work. In other words, they are so scared about the unemployed that they consider it necessary to get rid of as many of them as they possibly can in the shortest time. And soon we shall find boatloads of these workless citizens being carried across the seas to fill up the empty spaces in the Colonies, some to find new homes, perhaps, but many to find they have got out of the frying-pan into the fire. That, however, will not worry our rulers as long as they can keep their game preserves and deer forests intact. It is but a repetition of the Sutherland clearances in Scotland during the Napoleonic wars, when the crofters were driven off their holdings to make way for the more profitable sheep, and forcibly put on ships and despatched to Canada.

The almost complete lack of interest in this matter in the Labour movement is astounding. Except in one or two instances, we never hear a demand for the expropriation of land on which to settle the workless. Road-making, afforestation, and many other schemes are brought forward; but that hungry men should utilise the land which they fought to defend never seems to enter their heads. Is it that factory life has unfitted men for a life on the land? If so, what will they do in the Colonies? Or is it not rather that the landed interests here are so powerful that no party dare offend them? We think the latter is the real reason. In any case, we believe that the unemployment problem is insoluble without land expropriation. Our population is increasing at the rate of 1,000 a day, and no emigration scheme will keep pace with that; and sooner or later we shall be forced to utilise the land for more intensive food production. Landlordism may stand in the way for a time, but, the longer it does, the greater will be the force with which it will be swept away, and a good many other rotten institutions with it.

The International Anarchist Congress.

This Congress, due chiefly to the urging of the Italian Anarchist Union last summer, met in Berlin, December 25, 1921, and was in constant session until January 2, 1922. All arrangements had been entrusted to the Federation of Anarchist Communists of Germany, and they had provided an admirable meeting-place in the large building owned by the Workingmen's Syndicates of Berlin. Forty-six delegates, representing fourteen countries, attended, from lands as far apart as China and the United States, Siberia and South America. The Congress, therefore, was essentially international, and if the attendance was comparatively small full allowance must be made for the great difficulties of the times and the obstacles imposed by practically every Government. Naturally those Anarchists who have been most militant were the ones who found the passport problem insurmountable, and many of our most energetic comrades, persecuted relentlessly by the authorities, were still in gaol. Those best known in the movement, whose long experience and achievements give their counsel special weight, were largely absent.

Despite all this, we are of opinion that the Congress did valuable work. The reports rendered by the delegates have furnished a store of much-needed and encouraging information, and leading issues of the first importance, on which the international movement has still to reach a firm and definite decision, were thrashed out very thoroughly in prolonged debates. Inevitably there were diverging views, and differences of national temperament came to the surface. Speaking broadly, the comrades from the Northern countries showed themselves most concerned for the clarification of ideas, while those from the South were more anxious to concentrate on means and ways toward action. The order of business was as follows:—

The constitution of the Congress; reports by delegates on the movement in their respective countries; Anarchism and organisation; Anarchism and the peasant problem; the so-called Dictatorship of the Proletariat; Anarchist activity in the Syndicalist movement; reconstruction of the Anarchist International Bureau; resolutions.

Rudolf Rocker gave the opening address, and instanced the recent history of the Russian and German revolutions as proving how correct was the position taken by Anarchism. He declared, with Bakunin, that Socialism must be free or it must cease to be, and that the Social Revolution could not be brought about by any Dictatorship, for that merely continued the division of mankind into masters and slaves. The Congress then took up the consideration of reports by delegates. To these we give such notice as our limited space permits, paying special attention to those countries in which the condition of the movement is less generally known to English readers.

BULGARIA.

Here the movement has developed greatly since the War, but its first definite launching may be dated back to 1909, when Djerjikoff founded *The Awakening* and a Ferrer school was started. The conclusion of the War found the demobilised soldiery largely in revolt, and the Bulgarian Anarchists, alone of all the allegedly revolutionary bodies, eagerly took up their cause. They also interested themselves actively in the great mining and railway strikes of 1919 and 1920. As a result they were hunted down remorselessly by the Government, and their three papers were suppressed. The movement has now been driven underground. The Bulgarian Anarchists are Federal Communists, and favour organisation by localities and districts.

SWEDEN.

The Social Democrats are in power and the Anarchists are treated with great harshness, many comrades having been imprisoned. The Anarchists have a separate Syndicalist organisation, founded in 1900, which has now a membership of 32,000. The Young Socialists are reported as leaning strongly toward Anarchistic thought, and the working men have founded numerous clubs which are run on federalist principles. Here we have a weekly paper, *Brand*, with a circulation of 3,000, and a monthly review, *Roda Fanor*, which issues 2,000 copies. The movement is modelled on that of Germany, and the Anarchist organisation, as such, is said to have several thousand members. It holds a Congress once in every three years. The Bolshevik movement, which showed at one time considerable strength, is reported as

losing ground, thanks to the authoritarian attitude assumed by Moscow.

NORWAY.

Here also Bolshevik influence is reported as on the wane, but the Syndicalist movement has been adding largely to its numbers. Anarchist agitation in this country dates back to 1882, when Trane, giving wide publicity to Bakunin's thought, started an anti-State propaganda. This the authorities crushed. Stirner and Nietzsche were for many years the dominant influence, but the later trend has been toward Anarchist Communism. The Young Socialist-Anarchists publish *Revolt*, 2,000 copies, and the Anarchist-Syndicalists a weekly, *Alarm*, with a circulation of 3,000. In this country, as in Sweden, anti-militarist feeling and agitation are strong.

DENMARK.

The country being so largely agricultural, the Anarchist movement is reported as weak. Comrades work chiefly through the old centralised Syndicalist and other reform bodies. They have, however, a monthly, the *Red War*, with a circulation of 2,000 copies.

HUNGARY.

Prior to the War the movement supported a weekly, *Without State*, which printed 4,500 copies. The censorship suppressed it and threw its editors into prison. The Anarchists, however, kept up a strong anti-militarist agitation, for which they suffered severely. With the cessation of hostilities their propaganda took a much broader sweep, and during the revolutionary period there was intense activity, many groups being formed, a new paper started by them getting immediately a circulation of 10,000. They report that with the coming into power of Bela Kun, the Bolshevik, their position became one of great difficulty. The reaction, under Horthy, has made open propaganda impossible.

ITALY.

Recent events here have been discussed so fully in these columns, and elsewhere, that the general situation is fairly well known. Our comrades registered the opinion that no centralised revolutionary movement can hope to succeed in Italy, and that the future is full of promise. Any adequate criticism would have to pass in review the activities of the Fascisti, Socialists, Clerical-Socialists, and many other bodies, for which, unfortunately, we have not the space required.

HOLLAND.

The delegates reported the Union of Anarchist Action of Holland as being that which has the largest membership. It issues twice a week 3,500 copies of *De Vrije Socialist* (The Free Socialist), and is now taking steps toward publication three times a week. The amalgamation of this paper with *De Arbeider* (The Worker) is now under consideration. Our comrades have also a co-operative printery in Amsterdam. It was started in July, 1920, and they have published already translations of Bakunin, Kropotkin, Nieuwenhuis, and other noted Anarchist writers. As opposed to the Union of Religious Anarchist Communists they combat religion, and they reject the centralising methods of organisation adopted by the Federation of Social Anarchists. Their groups work in harmony with Syndicalists, but refuse to participate in politics; and they combatted with considerable success the introduction of the compulsory vote. Waging persistently a vigorous campaign against Militarism and State violence, they have been subjected in Holland, as everywhere, to constant persecution.

ORGANISATION DISCUSSED.

Comrade Rocker reported the German movement as being organised by localities, districts, and nationally, with a dues-paying card membership. Its organ is *Der Freie Arbeiter*, which prints 7,000 copies weekly. He regretted that here, as at all previous Anarchist Congresses, this question had been made the first order of the day, for he regarded the need of organisation as beyond dispute. Proudhon, though combatting the State philosophy of Louis Blanc, had stood throughout for organisation, as had Bakunin. Stirner, Mackay, and Nietzsche represented merely the natural reaction to the arbitrary methods of German Social Democracy. The Amsterdam Congress had shown a practical unanimity in favour of organisation, and the Russian Revolution had demonstrated its necessity as absolute. In reality, there was only a choice between three things: (1) Anarchists working through the medium of existing Labour bodies and having no special organisation of their own—as favoured by James Guillaume; (2) organisation exclusively Anarchistic—as favoured by Malatesta; (3) adherence to both these forms—as

urged by Kropotkin. He added that, "whatever might be the form of Anarchist organisation adopted, it could be only a framework for the Anarchist spirit and a means of propagating it."

Bjoerkund reported the Swedish Anarchists as being all in favour of organisation, the method they have adopted being the formation of autonomous clubs, members of which pay dues locally and also to the central body. They are also affiliated with and pay dues to the Anti-Militarist International. Individualist Anarchism has not attained, he said, any substantial growth in Sweden.

Fister, speaking for France, referred members to the resolutions on this subject adopted at the Lyons Congress; and De Ligt, for Holland, reported the Dutch comrades as all favouring organisation, but as being opposed to bureaucracy and centralisation. He thought concentration, which he defined as cohesion of effort, should not be confused with centralisation, which paralyses effort. "Individualism," he said, "is a product of bourgeois society."

The Italian Anarchist Union, at its Bologna Congress, held in November, 1920, declared itself in favour of national and international organisation, but not unanimously. It appears, however, that the dissentients form local groups, and it was stated that both sections work together harmoniously. Canada was reported by Volge as favouring local, district, and national groupings; and the Bulgarian comrades stated that they were organised by districts and sub-districts. They have an international correspondence bureau, located at Sofia. All contributions are voluntary, they have no presidents, and their federation secretaries are appointed solely for the execution of necessary administrative work.

A strong note of dissent came from the Rhineland and Westphalia delegates. They led the opposition and withdrew before the end of the discussions, accompanied by the Young Anarchists. Karl Langer acted as their spokesman, and said, in part: "The Anarchists of Rhineland and Westphalia, although unorganised, do serious work and do it successfully. They protest against organisation because they consider that its tendency is to standardise Anarchist thought. Instinctively, and without either statutes or organisation, men's souls draw together for defence and for attack." He stated that in Rhineland and Westphalia they had sixty "very active" groups, and emphasised the valuable work they had done in the Ruhr and during the Kapp coup d'état, taking their stand beside the workingmen and fighting with them. He attacked most bitterly the German, French, and Italian Anarchist organisations. "There are ten thousand organised Anarchists in France," he said, "and eighteen thousand in Italy. What have they done?" An Italian comrade resented strongly the imputation that the Anarchists of his country had been less energetic. He was for organisation, but it must be free and autonomous.

This exhaustive discussion showed clearly that the delegates, in the mass, were for a federalist form of organisation which should leave the hands of individuals and individual groups entirely free. They agreed in condemning whatever tended to check individual initiative, but considered that organisation was needed for collective action, which is indispensable.

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

Haussart opened the discussion by reading, on behalf of the French delegation, a declaration similar to that adopted at the Lyons Congress. Kahn, speaking for Germany, opposed dictatorship in every form; and De Ligt, for Holland, stated that the Anarchists of Social Action, with a membership of about 3,500, take a similar stand. He said, however, that there was a section calling itself Social-Anarchist, with a membership of about 2,000, which draws a distinction between economic and political dictatorship, favouring the former and rejecting the latter. There is also in Holland a current of Tolstoyan thought which opposes dictatorship and violence of all kinds. Despite these theoretical differences, said De Ligt, all agreed on the necessity of keeping up the struggle against bourgeois reaction, and at the Hague International Anti-militarist Congress, in March of 1921, all sections of Dutch Anarchism, acting in unison with those who belonged to the Third International, declared themselves in favour of immediate and vigorous struggle against bourgeois dictatorship. He wished the Congress to put itself clearly on record against all dictatorship, bourgeois or proletarian.

Volge reported that the Russian-speaking Anarchists of Canada, in their Congress of November, 1921, while emphasising the necessity of resisting Capitalism's exactions, declared them-

Continued on page 19.)

KRONSTADT--THE PARIS COMMUNE OF RUSSIA.

By ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

Bourgeois Governments and Capitalism are outspoken enemies of every revolutionary movement. As such the progressive workers know them. As such they wage war against them. The Communards of Paris, for instance, knew that they could expect neither justice or mercy from their militarist rulers, against whom they had risen in rebellion. But that a political party that calls itself revolutionary, a Government that dares to speak in the name of the proletariat, should drown that proletariat's cry for justice and liberty in a sea of blood,—that stands as the most monumental Judas crime in all history. That it should, moreover, blacken and denounce the popular, heroic attempt at social justice as counter-revolution is a crime so monstrous that humanity will never forgive.

I am speaking of Kronstadt. Kronstadt was indeed the Paris Commune of Russia. Kremlin played the part of Versailles. Lenin was its Thiers; Trotsky its Gallifet.

It was the year 1921. The wars were at an end, and the long-suffering people now hoped that the Bolsheviks would cease their suppression and terror, and permit the released energies of the masses to begin the economic reconstruction of the country. The workers were still eager to co-operate, to put their initiative and creative efforts to the upbuilding of their ruined land. Vain faith! The Bolsheviks continued, as before, their policy of suppression, terror, and militarisation. The last hope of the proletariat was perishing; they realised that the Communist State was more concerned in retaining political power than in saving the Revolution.

The most revolutionary element of Russia, the workers of Petrograd, were the first to speak out. Bolshevik centralisation, inefficiency, and corruption, and their autocratic attitude toward the peasants and workers, had—more than any other cause—brought the people to the extreme of misery and suffering. Many factories and mills of Petrograd had been closed. The toilers were literally starving to death. The Petrograd workers called meetings to consult about the unbearable situation. *The meetings were suppressed by the Government.* Feeling against such methods continued to grow. More meetings were called, with the same result. The Bolsheviks would make no concessions to the proletariat, while at the same time they were making every compromise with World Capitalism. The workers were aroused. To force the Government to listen to their demands, strikes were called in the Trubotchny, Patronny, Baltyski, and Laferm factories and mills. Instead of talking matters over with the workers, the Government organised a military "Committee of Defence" (*Komitet Oborony*), with Zinoviev, the most hated man in Petrograd, as its chairman. The purpose of the Committee of Defence was to suppress the dissatisfaction of the proletariat.

It was on the 24th of February that the mentioned strikes were declared. On the same morning the Bolsheviks sent the *kursanti*, of the military school for officers, all of them Communists, to disperse the workers on the Vassilevsky Ostrov, the labour district of Petrograd. The next day, February 25, the outraged toilers of Vassilevsky Ostrov visited the Admiralty shops and Galernaya docks, and induced the workers there to join their protest against the brutality of the "Workers' and Peasants' Government." The attempted street demonstration of the strikers was dispersed by armed soldiery.

On February 26, at the session of the Petrograd Soviet, Lashevitch—a member of the Committee of Defence, and also of the Revolutionary Military Soviet of the Republic—denounced the strikers and proposed that the Trubotchny factory be closed. The Executive Committee of the Soviet (Zinoviev, etc.) accepted the proposition, and the workers were *locked out*, deprived of all rations, and literally thrown on the streets to starve.

The despotic methods of the Government embittered and antagonised the workers. Meanwhile the Bolsheviks had concentrated in Petrograd a large number of troops from the provinces and its most trusted Communist troops from the front. The labour unrest was crushed with an iron hand.

II.

The Kronstadt sailors were much disturbed by events in Petrograd. They sent a committee to investigate, charged with this message to the workers: "If you are counter-revolutionary, as the Bolsheviks claim, we are against you; but if your demands are just, we are in solidarity with you."

On March 1 a public meeting was held at the Yakorny Square, Kronstadt, officially called by the First and Second Brigades of the line ships of the Baltic Fleet. Sixteen thousand sailors, Red Army soldiers, and workers attended the gathering. It was presided over by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kronstadt Soviet, the Communist Vassilief. The President of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, Kalinin, and the High Commissar of the Baltic Fleet, Kuzmin, were present at the meeting. It may be mentioned, as indicative of the friendly disposition of the sailors to the Bolshevik Government, that Kalinin was met on his arrival in Kronstadt with military honours, music, and banners.

The committee of sailors sent to Petrograd made its report. It corroborated the worst fears of Kronstadt. The meeting was outraged to learn how the Bolshevik Government crushed the modest demands of the Petrograd workers with bloody terror. The gathering passed the since famous resolutions, the most important of which were:—

"In view of the fact that present Soviets do not express the will of the workers and peasants, immediately to hold new elections, with secret balloting;

"Freedom of speech and press for workers and peasants, for Anarchists and Left Socialist parties;

"Liberation of all political prisoners of Socialist parties; also of workers and peasants, Red Army soldiers and sailors imprisoned in connection with the labour and peasant movement."

The meeting passed these resolutions unanimously, with the two dissenting voices of Kalinin and Vassilief. It also sent a committee to the Petrograd workers, to come to an understanding regarding the joint demands of Petrograd and Kronstadt. This committee, consisting of thirty members, was arrested by the Bolsheviks on arrival in the city. It was the first blow struck by the Government against the Kronstadt sailors. The fate of the committee remained a mystery.

On the morning after the Kronstadt meeting, March 2, the Communist State issued a *prikaz* (order), signed by Lenin and Trotsky. It denounced the Kronstadt movement as a *nyatsezh*, an armed uprising against the Bolshevik Government. And immediately there began a world-wide campaign of lying and falsification, branding the revolutionary Kronstadt sailors as counter-revolutionists. What followed is well known. Kronstadt was declared outlawed. In the language of the Kremlin dictatorship it meant extermination.

The Bolshevik Government set March 7 as the date for an artillery attack upon Kronstadt. The thing seemed so monstrous, so incredible, that even many Communists did not believe it possible. But Trotsky had already sent word to the people of Kronstadt, "I'll shoot you like pheasants." It was March 6. A group of several Anarchists made a last attempt to bring the Bolsheviks to their senses. I was at the time very friendly with Zinoviev. I felt it my duty to the Revolution to make an attempt, even if hopeless, to prevent the threatened massacre of the revolutionary flower of Russia, the Kronstadt sailors and workers. Together with several comrades I wrote a protest to the Committee of Defence, pointing out the peaceful intentions and just demands of the Kronstadt sailors, reminding Zinoviev of their splendid revolutionary past, and suggesting a method of settling the dispute in a manner befitting comrades and revolutionists.

The document was delivered to Zinoviev. I do not know whether it was discussed in the council of the Committee of Defence; at any rate, it was ignored. Some time later Zinoviev asked me, in a personal talk, whether I myself would have participated in a Commission to arrange matters with Kronstadt, as our document had proposed. "I would have been happy to do so," I told him, "especially since it was the Kronstadt sailors and Petrograd workers who had saved my life by their demonstrations against the American Ambassador, Francis, when California demanded my extradition in the Mooney case." Zinoviev turned pale. My words reminded him of the time when the Petrograd workers had saved him from the clutches of Kerensky, and now—now he had become their executioner.

At 6.45 on the evening of March 7 the heavy thunder of artillery echoed through the streets of Petrograd. Trotsky had attacked Kronstadt! The Bolsheviks had fired the first shot, and the blackest page of their régime was being written.

Ten bloody days, and the struggle was over. On March 18 the Bolsheviks commemorated the Paris Commune and celebrated at the same time—O irony of hell!—their victory over Kronstadt. Over 14,000 men lay dead as a result of that "victory," and history wrote across the name of the Communist Party of Russia: *The Judas of the Revolution.*

Stockholm, March, 1922.

Tom Mann Replies to Emma Goldman.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

COMRADE,—I have received a marked copy of FREEDOM for February, directing attention to the contribution by Comrade Emma Goldman, on "The Red Trade Union Congress and the Anarchist Prisoners," and I am quoted as having read a letter purporting to come from the imprisoned Anarchists and as having said I was "satisfied as to the guilt of the Anarchists." Whatever of difference there may be, Emma Goldman is quite ready to be fair, I am quite sure; so I wish to say that I saw no such letter as that referred to, and most certainly have never said I was "satisfied as to the guilt of the Anarchists." I do not know what may have been said by others; I certainly have not said so. Will you allow me to make clear what part I had in any attempted negotiations on this matter at Moscow?

At the opening meeting of the R.T.U. Congress I was much interested in meeting Comrades Goldman and Berkman, who were present as visitors. We had met on previous occasions many miles from Russia, and I had a great admiration for their excellent propaganda work. At Moscow I soon learned from them that they held views concerning the Soviet authorities that differed materially from mine. This I was not surprised at, I expected it, and was prepared to allow fully in my own mind without any trouble. Very early on in the Congress I was told of the necessity for some stand being made on behalf of the Anarchists in prison, and I found that considerable excitement prevailed because several delegates, especially amongst the French and Spanish groups, were very desirous of taking action to see that the matter was dealt with, and I was approached and asked, would I co-operate with them? and I at once agreed to do so; and as I had only been in Russia a few days, and some of the delegates referred to had been there considerably longer, I deferred to their judgment as to the right action to be taken. Also, I had been elected on the Presidium of the Congress, which necessitated constant attention to the work of the Congress, and they, the other members of what has been referred to as the Committee, agreed to tell me what decision they had arrived at as to the best course to take. I was duly informed they had agreed that the best course to pursue would be first to interview Comrade Lenin on the subject, and they intended to do so that same night. I agreed to accompany them and did so. It was after 11 p.m. when we met Lenin. I opened by putting the chief object aimed at by the deputation, and then a general interchange of opinion took place, for fully an hour and a half, between the members of the deputation and Lenin. Each and every person there had the opportunity to interrogate, and was met, as every one admitted, in a frank and straight manner. Lenin said he had not power to do what the deputation asked, but he would, early the next morning (it was midnight then), get the responsible Committee together to again consider the whole matter, which, he said, had already been exhaustively dealt with.

The deputation expressed satisfaction at this, and arranged to keep in touch with those who would give them the decision of the Committee.

Later I received a copy of the letter sent to each of the deputation. No need here to touch upon that. Several of those who composed the deputation gave constant attention to this matter, leaving the Congress in order to do so, and reported to me from time to time as to their experiences. They knew I was ready to go to visit any one if need be; they said they were doing all that could be done, and I could keep on with the Congress work. My understanding was, and still is, that I could not have done anything other than they did; and I conclude that the reason a somewhat harsh view is expressed about myself is due to the fact that I appreciate the Soviets and the Russian authorities in a different degree to that of others, who perhaps with much fuller knowledge take a different view.—Fraternally,

TOM MANN.

[We are pleased to know that Tom Mann did not say he was satisfied as to the guilt of the Anarchists in prison. But his complaint should be lodged against Harry Pollitt, whose account of the affair seems to have been a lie from beginning to end. He not only said that "Tom Mann, himself, and others were absolutely satisfied as to the guilt of the Anarchists," but backed up his statement by saying that he himself, Tom Mann, and others visited them in prison and granted pardons to some of them. Mr. Pollitt saw the report of his statement in the October issue of FREEDOM, and has not contradicted it. As Mr. Pollitt is a co-worker with Tom Mann in the office of the British section of the Red Trade Union International, we think Tom Mann might ask him for an explanation. But this incident is only another proof that most of the supporters of the Moscow Dictatorship will stick at no lie in order to slander the Anarchists and bolster up the present régime.—ED. FREEDOM.]

Answers to Correspondents.

F. H. WARNE (Plymouth).—We never suggested that a reduction of interest on the National Debt would benefit the producing class. In fact, as you say in your letter, at the end of our note on "The Economy Stunt" we said it was only a capitalists' squabble. You have tried to read into it what is not there. Your gun has missed fire.

MRS. S. CAHILL.—Sorry we have no room for your letter. There are several colonies in England where comrades are already experimenting on the lines you suggest.

"Eager to be Exploited."

The Bolsheviks are delightfully frank. The New York *World* of December 18 last published an article headed, "Why Russian Soviets Turned to Capitalism: Explained by S. A. Heller," who is the Russian Trade Envoy to the United States. After saying that Russia needs capital, therefore the Soviets have turned capitalist, Mr. Heller sets out the many advantages awaiting investors of capital in Russia, and assures them that

"there is an industrious and intelligent population eager to be exploited at lower wages than can obtain in any other white man's country."

It reads like an extract from the prospectus of a West African company. The Bolsheviks' "new economic policy" looks remarkably like the capitalists' old economic policy.

For Anarchists in Russian Prisons.

According to the New York *Call*, M. Abramovitch, leader of the Menshevik Party, now residing in Berlin, has received word from Moscow that the Mensheviks in Moscow prisons have been released on the condition that they go to live for two years in certain provincial cities or leave Russia entirely. The Social Revolutionaries and the Anarchists have not been released. We must, therefore, continue to send help to our comrades, and we shall be pleased to acknowledge all monies received on their behalf. The following sums have been received in answer to last month's appeal in FREEDOM:—

T. S. 6s., A. Corum 5s., G. A. R. (Bath) 2s., E. Ratcliffe 5s., W. M. S. 2s. 6d., A. Sanders 2s., B. Platten 2s., E. F. Dean 1s., J. S. R. 10s., L. G. Wolfe £1, Taxi 10s., T. H. K. 5s., B. L. 10s., Bristol Comrades (per J. F. G.) £5. Total, £9 0s. 6d.

(Continued from page 17.)

selves utterly opposed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. "Dictatorship is the worst of all the forms oppression takes. Never can it be anything else than the dictatorship of a party imposed on the mass of the workers. Certain Anarchist-Syndicalists accept the idea of an Economic Dictatorship, but the Congress declares that this would have as its immediate effect the creation of a new Syndicalist bureaucracy which would be dangerous and injurious to the development of the Social Revolution. The Congress rejects even the class-war theory, for this necessarily presupposes the domination of one class by another. Authority, though clad in a proletarian blouse, would retain none the less its harmful and anti-social character. Anarchism implies essentially the disappearance of classes and the complete emancipation of all mankind."

Bjoerklund, speaking for the Swedish Anarchists, declared them opposed to all dictatorship, and expressed regret that certain comrades in Holland still believed in it. De Ligt replied that in Sweden, as elsewhere, the Revolution would be the work of a minority, that we could not expect it to be purely Anarchistic, and that we must participate in it notwithstanding, struggling always to diminish oppression and enlarge liberty, as did both Marx and Bakunin.

Llyado, on behalf of the Spanish comrades, declared that they rejected absolutely the dictatorship ideal. He put the matter thus: "The violence to which those in revolt resort is only a form of legitimate defence. It must not be confused with the violence of a dictatorship, which oppresses and enslaves."

The unanimity of opinion on this question of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat cannot fail to strike the most casual reader.

The Congress subsequently held a private session at which the question of reprisals for the persecution of Anarchists by the Russian Dictatorship was discussed.

(The conclusion of this report will appear in our next issue.)

Objections to Anarchism.

By GEORGE BARRETT.

32 pages. Price 4d; post-free, 5d.; 13 copies, 3s.; postage extra.

Orders to FREEDOM PRESS, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1.

Friendship Demands Equality.

The time-honoured words of Mahabarata are as true as ever: "The ignorant are not the friends of the wise; the man who has no cart is not the friend of him who has a cart. Friendship is the daughter of equality; it is never born of inequality." Without doubt, it is given to some men, great by their thoughts, by sympathy, by strength of will, to win the multitude; but if the attachment of their fellows and admirers comes otherwise than of an enthusiastic affinity of idea to idea, or of heart to heart, it is speedily transformed into fanaticism or servility.

He who is hailed lord by the acclamations of the crowd must almost of necessity attribute to himself exceptional virtues, or a "grace of God," that marks him in his own estimation as a predestined being, and he usurps without hesitation or remorse privileges which he transmits as a heritage to his children. But, while in rank exalted, he is morally degraded, and his partisans and sycophants are more degraded still; they wait for the word of command which falls from the master's lips; when they hear in the depths of their conscience some faint note of dissent, it is stifled; they become practised liars; they stoop to flattery, and lose the power of looking men in the face. Between him who commands and him who obeys, and whose degradation deepens from generation to generation, there is no possibility of friendship. The virtues are transformed; brotherly frankness is destroyed; independence becomes a crime; above is either pitying condescension or haughty contempt, below either envious admiration or hidden hate.

Let each of us recall the past, and ask ourselves in all sincerity this question: "Who are the men in whose society we have experienced the most pleasure?" Are they personages who have "honoured" us with their conversation, or the humble with whom we have "deigned" to associate? Are they not rather our equals, those whose looks neither implore nor command, and whom we may love with open hearts without afterthought or reserve?—*Elisée Reclus*.

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST AID FEDERATION.

This organisation was formed at a conference held recently in New York, at which delegates were present from two Italian groups, one Spanish, one English, five Russian, and four Jewish groups. The object of the Federation is to help our persecuted comrades everywhere but more especially those in Russia and Spain, where persecution is more bitter. A fund has been opened, and those willing to help should write to the treasurer, J. Spivak, 4072 Third Avenue, New York City.

An Appeal for Frank Kitz.

We regret to say that our old comrade Frank Kitz is in urgent need of assistance. He has been in the movement for over fifty years, during which time he has always been an active propagandist. Now, over seventy years of age, he is no longer able to earn a living at his trade of dyer, and has only the miserable old-age pension of ten shillings weekly as a means of subsistence. A committee has been formed to raise funds on his behalf, and all those who can spare anything, however small, should send it direct to Councillor A. M. Wall, Treasurer of the Frank Kitz Appeal Committee, 1 Oxford Mansions, Bromell's Road, Clapham, London, S.W. 4.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF "FREEDOM."

The next Social and Dance for the benefit of FREEDOM will be held at the "Workers' Friend" Club, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel, E. (back of St. Mary's Station), on Saturday evening, April 8.

FREE SOCIETY.

Issued Monthly by the Anarchist Communist Groups of the United States and Canada.

No Subscription. Voluntary Contributions. Order through FREEDOM.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

Clothing Workers Industrial Union, Local No. 9.

A Literary Evening (with songs and speeches) will take place on Saturday, April 1, at the Workers' Friend Club, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel, E. Commence at 7.30. Admission free by ticket.

To Our Readers.

The final instalment of "Anarchism versus Socialism" is unavoidably held over to next month, when we will publish another splendid article by Alexander Berkman, dealing with Makhno's relations with the Bolsheviks; also another article by M. N. on Bakunin's "Confession." Our articles on Russia are causing consternation in the ranks of the Communist Party, whose only reply is lies and slanders. We hope our comrades will push the sale of FREEDOM as much as possible. We have printed extra copies of the issues containing these articles, and can supply repeat orders and back numbers.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(February 12 to March 11.)

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.—Lipman 2s. 6d., H. G. Russell 5s., J. Buchie 4s. 6d., Per H. Dubroff (Detroit) £1 7s. 9d., A. Sanders 2s., Proceeds of Concert £1 12s., A. D. Moore 2s., R. Hawkin £1, J. S. R. 2s., L. G. Wolfe £1, Per G. W. Tindale 10s., Taxi 10s.
"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—S. Jaffe, J. Sellar, T. S., T. Foxall, S. Slive, E. J. Ridgway, H. A. Johnson, E. Bairstow, T. Brothers, H. N. Pumpkin, J. Buchie, A. Kataoka, D. Caffodio, I. Schutz, L. Adameik.

ANARCHISM AND THE WORLD-REVOLUTION.

An Answer to Robert Minor.

By FRED S. GRAHAM.

This pamphlet deals trenchantly with Bolshevik criticisms of Anarchism, and also gives a short account of the part played by Anarchists in the Russian Revolution.

Price 1s., postage 2d. To U.S.A., 20 cents post-free.

BOOK AND PAMPHLET LIST.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 4d.
THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.
ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 3d.
THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 2d.
ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By George Barrett. 2d.
ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By John Wakeman. 2d.
ENGLAND MONOPOLISED OR ENGLAND FREE? By "Senex." 2d.
THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 2d.
FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. 6d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
LIBERTY THROUGH ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. By H. OAKLEY. 1d.
ANARCHIST COMMUNISM IN PLAIN ENGLISH. By L. A. Motler. 1d.
THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.
REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL JUSTICE. (Selections from the Writings of William Godwin.) 4d.
ANARCHY. By E. Girard. 1d.
Postage extra—1d. for each 3 pamphlets.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper covers, 1s.; postage 2d.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s.; postage 4d.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s.; post. 3d.
MUTUAL AID. By P. Kropotkin. Paper, 2s. net; postage 3d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By William Morris. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. Proudhon. Cloth (1 vol.), 4s. 6d.; papers covers (in two vols.), 3s.; postage 5d.
SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. Pataud and E. Pouget. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
WALDEN. By Henry Thoreau. 2s.; postage 3d.
SONGS OF FREEDOM. Edited by H. Salt. Cloth, 1s. 6d.; postage 3d.
POLITICAL JUSTICE: Essay on Property. By William Godwin. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; postage 3d.
THE SOUL OF MAN UNDER SOCIALISM. By Oscar Wilde. Limp Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 2d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; postage 3d.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
CIVILIZATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By E. Carpenter. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net, paper 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; paper, 1s.; postage 2d.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 8d., postage 1d.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W. 1.

Printed & Published by the Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W. 1.